



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

astrous in their influence on society than any merely material loss.

A very able and high-minded French Prince, the Prince de Joinville, has published his deliberate opinion, that in the enormous demand which the Government proposes to make on the population, that it may have a million and a quarter trained soldiers at its disposal, France is living upon its capital of men. The prince declares that no population can bear such a drain unimpaired. The yearly demand must exhaust the nation, diminish its rate of increase, and impair fatally its industrial power. This is the most formidable item of the account. Money may be replaced, industry may be revived, moral habits may recover their tone; but a population, whose vital strength is exhausted, has nothing to look to in the future but decay. Statesmen seem to be at last awakening to the truth that the present military system, the armed peace which every nation in Europe contributes to maintain, is exhausting the very vital stamina of society. The warning voice of the French prince has been earnestly re-echoed by Lord Stanley when he said that the present system must come to an end, since no nation can bear the burden of conscription and taxation much longer. Europe is just consuming its own vitals; and unless some speedy way of return be found to moderate armaments and economic government, honest trading and purer life, Europe will be found lying as paralysed and helpless before the flood of Slavonic conquest with which the alarmists threaten us, as Rome once lay before the scourge of Attila and his Huns. — *J. B. Brown.*

STANDING ARMIES.—A SIGNIFICANT CONTRAST.

IN 1820, says Edmond Potonie, "Europe supported 1,200,000 men; in 1865, it reached 3,800,000; now it is *more than six millions*. While Europe is burdened by her armies, the young and vigorous America, which reckoned 1,050,000 men in the Federal Army on the first of May, 1865, had disbanded 700,000 by the last of the same year, and to-day (1869), there are but 25,000 men under the flag. Is it better to lose the training, or to lose the people?"

Mark in this the tendency of large armaments in Europe to a steady, indefinite increase. Here is an increase of 500 per cent., in less than fifty years. Where is this enormous evil to stop? If not arrested, must it not end in universal, irredeemable bankruptcy?

Our own policy is a striking contrast. We have at most only the germ, or nucleus of a regular army, but nothing that would in Europe be called a Standing Army. Ours is only a handful of men trained to arms, as a species of national police to aid the government in enforcing its laws. It does not profess to be a preparation for actual war; and whenever that comes, the men and the materials must be extemporized to meet the emergency.

Thus ours is a system, not so much of war as of peace; and this policy, if adopted by Europe, would effect there a disarmament far beyond what even the friends of peace, most of them, have hitherto demanded; for we do not understand them as objecting to the use, if necessary, of an *armed police* for the support of government in the execution of its laws. Even the London Peace Society, thought to be sufficiently radical, has always recognized the right and duty of rulers to enforce law against its violators, and thus guard the peace and welfare of society at large.

Thus *our* war-system, if such it may be called, is quite unlike that of Europe. The latter is kept up at as great an expense as the people can be made to bear, not to preserve peace and order at home, but to fight other nations, while ours is used chiefly as a handmaid of our government in supporting its authority among ourselves, and ensuring a due enforcement of our laws. Its duties are for the country at large very like the local police in Boston or New York. Its main purpose is not War but Peace—peace at home; and if the habits of our people, and the policy of our government were to prevail all over Europe, they would go far to supersede her present war-system, and certainly would insure a more entire disarmament there than has yet been proposed.

Is not our duty then plain and imperative as leaders to the world in peace, as well as in freedom and popular government? Such, we think, is now our special mission. The habits of our people, and the policy of our government peculiarly qualify us to do this; and we certainly can, if we will, do it more easily and more effectually than any other nation. We now stand confessedly at the head of other governmental reforms; and if we will champion this greatest of them all, we shall cap the climax of our achievements for the benefit of our race.

DEMOCRACY FAVORABLE TO PEACE. — "There has been some progress since Waterloo. That enormous butcher's bill has not been forgotten. It can hardly be doubted that fifty years ago such a controversy as that in which the United States and ourselves are now engaged, would have led to hostilities. That it has not done so now, that nations generally are more reluctant to fight than they were formerly, is, we believe, due chiefly to two causes, — the *increase of commerce*. * * * The second cause is the *increase of Democracy*. It was said many years ago that war is a game which, if their subjects were wise, kings would not be suffered to play at. But the subjects at that time had no power to prevent it. They were without political privileges; they could do nothing. All is changed. The people are now virtually self-governed; it is they who decide if there shall be peace or war; and as it is they who have to bear all the burden of the latter alternative, their voices are generally for the former. Of old, the kings played the madman, and the people were punished. The people now keep their kings under restraint if necessary. It comes to pass that just in proportion as a country becomes democratic does it become peaceful. The Working Men's International Congress at Geneva was so democratic that Napoleon was alarmed by it. Europe, at all events, had no reason to be alarmed, for while Napoleon was forcing his Conscription Bill through the French Legislature, the Congress were raising the cry of "*War against War*." — *English Paper.*

PROGRESS OF POPULAR GOVERNMENT.—We see it stated that "Russia, Turkey and the Grand Duchy of Mecklenburg are now the only countries in Europe which do not possess a national representative assembly;" in other words, where democracy, popular rule or influence, does not prevail in the government. A vast stride this of improvement in the special interest of the people; all the result not of war, but of peaceful, moral influences, and a sure proof and pledge that a pacific policy is steadily gaining favor, and will in time, if not soon, supersede that of war. The people, as far as enlightened, see that the war-system is their worst foe; and whenever they come to bear sway in fact, whether in form or not, they will either abolish this system entirely, or shear it of its power to do its present mischief to themselves.